

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*KD*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/244,130 02/04/99 DUJON

B 3495.0111-10

HM12/1215

EXAMINER

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
GARRETT AND DUNNER
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3315

KAUSHAL, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1633

12

DATE MAILED:

12/15/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory ActionApplication No.
09/244,130

Applicant(s)

DUJON et al

Examiner

SUMESH KAUSHAL

Group Art Unit
1633

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Dec 4, 2000 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Dec 4, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

The proposed amendment(s):

will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

will not be entered because:

- they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Group I intron encoded nuclease (Class I-V) would require further consideration and/or search.

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The claims 23-47 stand rejected under 35 USC 112(1) because the specification is not enabled for a transgenic mouse encoding the I-SceI endonuclease site for the reasons of record as set forth in the official action mailed on 6/5/00.

The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 23-47

The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ has has not been approved by the Examiner.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Other The specification only teaches the making of NIH3T3, mouse PCC7-s and yeast cells encoding the I-SceI site. Considering the unpredictability and amount of experimentation required (see office action 6/5/00) the specification fails to disclose a single working example of the transgenic mouse as claimed.

Deborah Clark
DEBORAH J. R. CLARK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600